

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated November 6, 2008, the Examiner confirms the election of the species of figure 2 and claims 1-5, 7-13, and 16-19 and withdraws claims 6, 14 and 15 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species. The Examiner objects to the specification and rejects claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph. The Examiner rejects claims 1, 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b), rejects claims 1, 8, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) and rejects claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C 103(a). Finally, the Examiner objects to claim 7. With this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 7 are amended, and claims 4, 8, 18 and 19 are canceled without prejudice. No claims are added. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 9-13, 16 and 17 and the rejoinder of previously-withdrawn claims 14 and 15. Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 7. Claim 7 has been written to incorporate the features of independent claim 1 as originally presented. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to claim 7 and submits that claim 7 is now in suitable condition for allowance.

The Examiner objects to the specification and is requiring that priority claims of the national stage application be placed in the first paragraph. Applicant submits that, since this data is listed in a proper Application Data Sheet, such a change is not needed under the rules. However, Applicant has so amended the specification to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner rejects claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that "the pin mating portion" in claims 4 and 5 and "the pin guide hole" in claim 5 lack antecedent basis. Applicant has canceled claim 4 and included its features in independent claim 1. In doing so, Applicant has corrected the antecedent basis problem noted by the Examiner. With respect to claim 5, Applicant has amended claim 5 to correct the antecedent basis problems noted by the Examiner

and to include the features of independent claim 1 as originally presented. Applicant submits that claims 4 and 5 are clear and definite and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pierik (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,178) and rejects claims 1, 8, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pierik (US Patent No. 6,736,096). The Examiner further rejects claims 2 and 3, dependent directly and indirectly from claim 1, under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierik in view of design choice. Claims 8, 18 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice, rendering the Examiner's rejections of these claims moot. Applicant further submits that the rejection of claim 1 is rendered moot by its amendment to incorporate the features of claim 4. The Examiner did not reject claim 4 on the basis of any prior art, and Applicant submits that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the combination of features described in amended claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that claim 5 is also allowable. Like claim 4, the Examiner did not reject claim 5 on the basis of any prior art, and Applicant submits that none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the combination of features described in amended claim 5. Due to the allowability of claim 5, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of dependent claim 6.

It is submitted that this Amendment has antecedent basis in the Application as originally filed, including the specification, claims and drawings, and that this Amendment does not add any new subject matter to the Application. Consideration of the Application in view of these comments is requested. It is submitted that the Application is in suitable condition for allowance; notice of which is requested.

Application Serial No. 10/573,769
Reply to Office Action dated November 6, 2008
Dated: February 4, 2009

Page 10 of 10

If the Examiner feels that prosecution of the present application can be expedited by way of an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MACFARLANE &
HELMHOLDT, P.C.

/Michelle L. Knight/

Michelle L. Knight
Registration No. 47711
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Ste. 624
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107